Louis Lafata

Response – McRuer’s “Compulsory Able-Bodiedness and Queer/Disabled Existence”

In Robert McCruer’s “Compulsory Able-Bodiedness and Queer/Disabled Existence,” he discusses many critiques of normalcy and presents us with two leading viewpoints. I thought that the way McCruer lead into his theory by explaining the similar structure of Adrienne Rich’s theory was very strategic. Rich simply states that dominant identities are accepted as the norm, but I liked how she provided a more conceptual insight to her theory. She discussed how homosexuality is merely looked at as a deviation from the nom, although it may be accepted, which I completely agree with. McCruer also speaks about “able bodied sexuality” in his article. He makes clear the distinction between able-bodied heterosexuality and disabled homosexuality, and how each group is classified together. One of McCruer’s major points that I agree with is his theory that the meanings of many things like masculinity, heterosexuality, etc, are bound up in “the problems that the term is being used to discuss.” To me, this means that these ideas are hard to discuss because people may have difficulty defining them. Overall, I agree with most if McCruer’s other ideas and would like to read more of his work.